

recommendation on that issue with sufficient specificity so as reasonably to alert the district court of the true ground for the objection.” Martin v. Duffy, 858 F.3d 239, 245 (4th Cir. 2017) (quotation omitted); see United States v. Midgette, 478 F.3d 616, 622 (4th Cir. 2007).

No party objected to the M&R; therefore, the court reviews for clear error. See Diamond, 416 F.3d at 315. The court has reviewed the M&R and the record. There is no clear error on the face of the record. See id.

In sum, the court ADOPTS the conclusions in the M&R allowing the case to proceed [D.E. 6] and GRANTS plaintiff’s motion to proceed in forma pauperis [D.E. 2]. The clerk is DIRECTED to issue the summons prepared by plaintiff. The U.S. Marshal is DIRECTED to serve the summons and a copy of the complaint on defendant.

SO ORDERED. This 4 day of April, 2024.


JAMES C. DEVER III
United States District Judge